



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,019	04/05/2001	Jeffrey McCaskey	88835.022400	4834

7590 11/26/2004

Thomas R. FitzGerald, Esq.
JAECKLE FLEICHMANN & MUGEL, LLP
39 State Street
Rochester, NY 14614-1310

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/827,019	MCCASKEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-67 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-67 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 9/17/2004, to the original application filed 4/5/2001.
2. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The objection to the drawings has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
5. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-15, 24-34, 44-45, 47-48, 51-52, 54, 56-58, and 63-64 under 35 U.S. C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
7. Claim 24 has been canceled by Applicant.
8. Claims 65-67 have been added by Applicant.
9. Claims 1-23 and 25-67 are pending. Claims 1,3 and 51 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 51-52, 54, 56-58, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1).

As per claims 3 and 51, Ferrell discloses an apparatus for automatically translating and recomposing news from news print publication electronic files to a form displayable on the World Wide Web (see Ferrel, Column 7, lines 5-9, Column 3, lines 47-67, and Column 35, lines 23-32). This system includes a server comprising one or more interconnected computer processors each with its own memory and secondary storage that is used for extracting, converting, storing, organizing and displaying news information on the World Wide Web. (See Ferrel, Figure 2, and Column 10, lines 17-33). This system includes publication storage, equivalent to an editorial database, which stores information extracted from print publication electronic files. This system also includes a means for extracting text information from the news print publication electronic ^{files}, converting the text information into a database format, and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2). Ferrel also discloses displaying a set of news Web pages to a Web user (See Ferrel, Figures 6 and 7). Ferrel also discloses the extraction, conversion and storage of properties data which is related to and stored with the story text (See Ferrel, Column 31, lines 59-67, Column 32, lines 1-4, and Figure 14). Note that Applicant defines tags as "a series of identifiably-marked data fields containing classification and other descriptive information concerning the story" (See Application, Page 7, lines 18-19). Ferrel does

*JF
11/9/01*

not disclose expressly that the properties data includes classification information. Wical discloses the inclusion of classification data related to a document (See Wical, Column 29, lines 33-52). Ferrel and Wical are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of storing and retrieving electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the classification information of Wical with the properties data of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to locate specific information, such as specific articles, from a large database (See Wical, Column 1, lines 11-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wical with Ferrel for the benefit of allowing a user to locate specific information to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3 and 51.

As per claim 52, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a method for extracting text information from the news print publication electronic files, located on the publisher workstations, and converting and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2).

As per claim 54, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses the step of proofing the set of news Web pages to change their appearance and organization. (See Ferrel, Column 16, lines 9-21).

As per claim 56, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses extracting, converting and storing story text information, providing a means for a proofreader to initiate a process for editorial database retrieval, conversion and formatting of the converted story text files and the

image for display on the World Wide Web, and providing a means for a proofreader to direct the converted raw story text files and the image files that have been retrieved, converted and formatted for display on the Web to a local caching object store which serves as a test news Website before publication of the Web page. (See Ferrel, Figure 11, Figure 12, and Column 24, lines 37-62).

As per claim 57, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses retrieving the Web page template files defining the form and interconnections of Web pages, and executing Web page template commands to replace the template directives with specific news text file electronic contents retrieved from the converted story text files from the publication storage database. (See Ferrel, Figure 1, Column 9, lines 9-41, Column 10, lines 34-47, Column 23, lines 58-64, and Figure 4).

As per claim 58, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses executing program code in the set of news Web pages to store current server information in the set of news Web pages. (See Ferrel, Figure 11, Figure 12, and Column 25, lines 21-51).

As per claim 63, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news information is published to a server that can be connected to the Internet, thus providing the news Web pages on a daily basis to the World Wide Web for presentation to Web users. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 26-37, and Column 24, lines 58-62).

As per claim 64, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news Web pages can be delivered to the World Wide Web for presentation to Web users on the basis of changes in news information. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 26-53).

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 10,12-15, 25-34, 44-45, 47-48, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662).

As per claim 1, Ferrell discloses an apparatus for translating and composing news text and images from a printed publication electronic format to a format displayable on a web browser (see Ferrel, Column 7, lines 5-9, Column 3, lines 47-67, and Column 35, lines 23-32). This system includes a server with memory and secondary storage that is used for storing, converting, organizing and displaying news information on the Web. (See Ferrel, Figure 2, and Column 10, lines 17-33). This system includes a means for receiving a plurality of print publication electronic files comprising news story text data and news story image data. (See Ferrel, Figure 3, and Column 4, lines 16-25, and Column 8, lines 62-64). This system includes publication storage, equivalent to an editorial database, which stores information extracted from print publication electronic files. This system also includes a means for extracting text information from the print publication electronic files, located on the publisher workstations, and converting and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2). This system also includes a publishing program for extracting the text information from the publication storage,

converting it to a format suitable for display on the Web, and storing it in a set of newspaper story text files capable of being displayed at a news Website on the World Wide Web. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 41-67, and Column 12, lines 1-5). Ferrel does not disclose expressly periodic extraction of text information from the news print publication electronic files. Dasan discloses the periodic extraction of text information from the news print publication electronic files (See Dasan, Figure 4, Column 5, lines 65-67, and Column 6, lines 1-10). Dasan also discloses that the periodic extraction can occur at regular intervals (See Dasan, Column 6, line 8). It is inherently true that extracting data hourly would be considered a regular interval. Ferrel and Dasan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the periodic extraction of text information from news print publication electronic files of Dasan with apparatus of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to keep the newspaper up-to-date. (See Dasan, Column 2, lines 29-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dasan with Ferrel for the benefit of keeping the newspaper up-to-date to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Claim 67 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

As per claim 2, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a plurality of templates used to organize the display of the news text files and edited news files on the Web. (See Ferrel, Column 15, lines 55-59).

Ferrel also teaches a set of news Web pages that can be displayed on the World Wide Web. (See Ferrel, Figure 6, and Column 17, lines 18-30).

As per claim 4, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the print publication electronic files comprise data files which contain stories or pictures (See Ferrel, Column 8, lines 62-64), which are included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 4.

As per claim 6, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a news image conversion program, incorporated in the Designer Component, which extracts image information from the news print publication electronic files, converts the image information into files in a common image format, and stores news print publication electronic files information in an electronic news image library. (See Ferrel, Column 10, lines 34-47, Column 23, lines 49-64, and Figure 10, element 565).

As per claim 10, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a means of drafting and editing the contents of the publication storage, associating the text data with image files and initiating the text extraction and publication programs. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 7-15, Figure 5, and Column 23, lines 51-57).

As per claim 12, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that each template contains a number of lists of links to other news stories and news Web pages. (See Ferrel, Figure 7).

As per claim 13, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the list of links contains a link to each section of the news. (See Ferrel, Figure 7, and Column 18, lines 7-10).

As per claim 14, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the list of links contains a link to each topic of the news in a single section of the news. (See Figure 7).

As per claim 15, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the templates comprise one or more templates consisting of a topic Web page template for presenting a number of news stories related to that topic, which is included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 15. In the example shown by Ferrel, the Business section is presented. (See Ferrel, Figure 8, and Column 19, lines 40-52).

As per claim 25, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the text data files contain news story data, formatting information, in the form of tags, which define the appearance of the data, and descriptive information defining the content of the data, in the form of a find properties object stream. (See Ferrel, Column 4, lines 16-32, and Figure 14).

As per claim 26, Ferrel and Dasan discloses the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the formatting information is stored in the form of codes (i.e. tags) of a text markup language. (See Ferrel, Figure 14).

As per claim 27, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Ferrel also shows tags for a markup language that are defined as

HTML tags. (See Ferrel, figure 14, and Column 32, lines 5-16. The tags shown by Ferrel are MPML tags. MPML is a version of HTML 2.0 – See Ferrel, Column 3, line 65).

As per claim 28, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the descriptive information is stored in the form of codes (i.e. tags) of a text markup language. (See Ferrel, Column 31, lines 59-67, and Column 23, lines 1-4).

As per claim 29, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the markup language used is MPML, which is a version of HTML 2.0 – See Ferrel, Column 3, line 65).

As per claim 30, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the descriptive information is stored in the form of keywords in the text of the news story. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 48-52).

As per claim 31, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news Web pages comprise text files. (See Ferrel, Column 4, lines 16-20).

As per claim 32, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the text files contain information that can be updated or modified when the file is displayed. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41).

As per claim 33, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a number of templates for organizing the display of the newspaper story text files on the World Wide Web, a set of news Web pages capable of

display on the World Wide Web, and where the news Web pages comprise image files. (See Ferrel, Column 8, lines 2-4, and Figure 8).

As per claim 34, Ferrel and Dasan discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that this system consists of a separate conversion computer, with its own main and secondary memory as is inherently true in the art, used to organize the text data files into news Web pages, and a Web server, also with its own main and secondary memory as is inherently true in the art, used to retrieve, update, and display the news Web pages for a reader. (See Ferrel, figure 3, Column 12, lines 27-67, and Column 13, lines 1-36).

As per claim 44, Ferrel and Dasan discloses the limitations of claim 34 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the templates contain code executable only on the server(s). (See Ferrel, Figure 11, and Column 24, lines 16-62).

As per claim 45, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that each template includes embedded directives for substitution of template content with the contents of other files which contain story data. (See Ferrel, Column 18, lines 33-42, and Figure 8).

As per claim 47, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the publisher, as shown in Ferrel, Figure 1, releases the project which contains the formatted story text. This makes the project files available on the network. (See Ferrel, Column 16, lines 49-57).

As per claim 48, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Ferrel also discloses the use of a Project Editor program and Designer program

to create a story Web page with embedded story text and images in a story Web page template, a main Web page template, a section Web page template and a topic Web page template. (See Ferrel, Column 17, lines 50-67, Column 18, lines 1-13, Figure 7 and Figure 8).

Claims 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Vaithyanathan (U.S. Patent 5,857,179).

As per claims 65-66, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel and Wical do not disclose expressly comparing keywords in a story being extracted to the keywords of at least two of the stories in the editorial database, calculating a value based on each comparison, assigning a weight for each keyword, and assigning as the topic to the story being extracted the topic of the story in the editorial database associated with the highest value calculated. Vaithyanathan discloses comparing keywords of a document to keywords in a cluster of documents (See Vaithyanathan, Claim 10), calculating a value based on the comparison (See Vaithyanathan, Column 5, lines 56-67, and Column 6, lines 1-30), categorizing a document based on the highest values calculated (See Vaithyanathan, Claim 12), and assigning a weight for each keyword (See Vaithyanathan, Claim 13, Column 5, lines 56-67, and Column 6, lines 1-30). Ferrel, Wical and Vaithyanathan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to include the comparison, calculation of values based on the comparison, and categorization of documents based on the calculation of Vaithyanathan with the news story data and publication storage database of Ferrel and Wical. The motivation for doing so would have been to categorize the stories in a time-efficient manner in order to provide for information filtering (See Vaithyanathan, Column 2, lines 20-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vaithyanathan with Ferrel and Wical for the benefit of categorizing the stories to enhance the filtering of information to obtain the invention as specified in claims 65-66.

Claims 5 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 6,449,616 B1).

As per claim 5, Ferrel and Dasan discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly an electronic news subscriber database for storing electronic mail addresses and information preferences of electronic news subscribers. Walker discloses a method for readers of newspapers, or similar printed media to obtain supplemental information, or portions of information, in the articles. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 46-54). Walker also discloses that this information is distributed to subscribers using electronic mail. The electronic mail addresses and preferences of the subscribers are stored in a subscriber database. (See Walker, Column 8, lines 66-67, and Column 9, lines 1-24). Ferrel, Dasan and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber database of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Dasan. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

As per claim 41, Ferrel, Dasan and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Walker also discloses that the subscriber database is a relational database. (See Walker, Column 7, lines 52-54). Ferrel, Dasan and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the relational subscriber database of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Dasan. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with rapid responses to requests for supplemental information. (See Walker, Column 7, lines 53-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of providing timely responses for information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 41.

As per claim 42, Ferrel, Dasan and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 41 as described above. Walker also discloses that the relational subscriber database has a table of subscriber information. (See Walker, Figure 3d). Ferrel, Dasan and Walker

are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber information table of Walker with the electronic news publication system utilizing a relational subscriber database, as disclosed by Ferrel, Dasan and Walker. The motivation for doing so would have been to store subscriber data necessary to effect the dissemination of information requested by a subscriber. (See Walker, Column 9, lines 17-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of storing subscriber data needed to distribute requested information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 42.

As per claim 43, Ferrel, Dasan and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Walker also discloses that the subscriber or user database contains files, or records, that contain data related by virtue of their content. (See Walker, Figure 3d). Ferrel, Dasan and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the related records contained in the subscriber information table of Walker with the electronic news publication system utilizing a relational subscriber database, as disclosed by Ferrel, Dasan and Walker. The motivation for doing so would have been to store subscriber data necessary to effect the dissemination of information requested by a subscriber. (See Walker, Column 9, lines 17-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Walker with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of storing subscriber data needed to distribute requested information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 43.

Claims 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 6,449,616 B1).

As per claim 61, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel and Wical do not disclose expressly the step of selecting and sending a set of news Web pages to news subscribers via electronic mail. Walker discloses that news Web pages are sent to subscribers by a delivery means as specified by the subscriber. (See Walker, Column 11, lines 43-51). Walker also discloses that the delivery means can be electronic mail. (See Walker, Figure 3D, element 292). Ferrel, Wical and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber news delivery method of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Wical. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Wical for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 61.

As per claim 62, Ferrel, Wical and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 61 as described above. Walker also discloses a means for a number of subscribers to request electronic mail presentation of news information. (See Walker, Figure 3D, elements 281 and 292). Walker also discloses a means for a subscriber to specify his or her selection criteria for news topics to be delivered. (See Walker, Figure 5a and Column 9, lines 48-59). Walker also discloses a means for extracting the news information from the set of news Web pages according to criteria selected by the subscriber. (See Walker, Figure 4, element 410, and Column 9, lines 32-47). Walker also discloses that a mail message is prepared and transmitted to each subscriber requesting electronic mail presentation of news information. (See Walker, Figure 7, and Column 11, lines 37-51). Ferrel, Wical and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber news delivery service of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel and Wical. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel and Wical for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 62.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1).

As per claim 7, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a content editor to edit information contained in the text files. (See Ferrel, Figure 12). Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly a classified advertisement database containing classified advertisement information, a classified notices program for editing text classified advertisement information, or a classified notices maintenance program for updating edited classified advertisement information. Kovack discloses a method for generating an electronic newspaper that includes a predefined page information database for a classified advertisement page. (See Kovack, Page 1, paragraph 0007, lines 16-23, Page 2, paragraph 0025, lines 1-2, and Page 4, claim 1). Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the predefined page information database for a classified advertisement page of Kovack with the content editing program of Ferrel and Dasan. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method to easily update information contained in the electronic publication that might require changes without having to update the page layout. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kovack with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of editing

classified advertisements in an electronic publication to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

As per claim 8, Ferrel and Dasan discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a content editor to edit information contained in the text files. (See Ferrel, Figure 12). Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly a death notices database containing death notice information or a death notices program for editing text death notice information. Kovack discloses a method for generating an electronic newspaper that includes a predefined page information database for an obituary page. (See Kovack, Page 1, paragraph 0007, lines 16-23, Page 2, paragraph 0025, lines 1-2, and Page 4, claim 1). Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the predefined page information database for an obituary page of Kovack with the content editing program of Ferrel and Dasan. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method to easily update information contained in the electronic publication that might require changes without having to update the page layout. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kovack with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of editing obituary information in an electronic publication to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Claim 9 is rejected on the same basis as claims 7 and 8.

Claims 11, 19, 21-23, and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Dabney (6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 11, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses an archiving program using containers for multiple projects. This program allows for the extraction, conversion, and storage of the text information. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 38-51, and figure 4). Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly that the text files are stored in an electronic news archive. Dabney discloses a content management system in which news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Since news information is collected and stored electronically on the relational database as disclosed by Dabney, this database serves as an electronic news archive. Ferrel, Dasan and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the news text and image translation and composition apparatus of Ferrel and Dasan with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and

Dasan for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As per claim 19, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly that the editorial database, or publication storage, resides on a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables"), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Dasan and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data storage system of Ferrel and Dasan with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

As per claim 21, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly a set of maintenance subprograms for updating information stored in the editorial database. Dabney

discloses a content management system in which news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Dabney also discloses that this data is maintained and edited by a plurality of content servers (See Dabney, Figure 3B, and Column 7, lines 3-4). The content server allows editors to electronically update the data. (See Dabney, Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-33 and Figure 11). Ferrel, Dasan and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the means for editing the contents of the editorial database of Ferrel and Dasan with the content server programs of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of an interface that would enable an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Claim 22 is rejected on the same basis as claim 11.

As per claim 23, Ferrel, Dasan and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the files, or titles, are contained in folders that are related by content. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 58-67).

As per claim 49, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a story finding maintenance Web page providing a list of headlines for a given day allowing a proofreader the ability to create a link to a

specific story in the database. (See Ferrel, Figure 7, Column 17, lines 50-67, and Column 18, lines 1-14). Ferrel also discloses a headline maintenance Web page which would enable a proofreader or editor to place stories on a section Web page in order of importance. (See Ferrel, Column 27, lines 56-67, Column 28, lines 1-3, and Figure 12, element 690). Ferrel also discloses a means for changing the published status of stories in the editorial database to permit their republication on the news Website. This is done using the "find properties" which include important information about the document. (See Ferrel, Figure 12, and Column 28, lines 14-40). Ferrel also discloses a means which would enable a proofreader to associate images with a specific story in the editorial database. (See Ferrel, Column 15, lines 55-67, and Column 16, lines 1-2, lines 11-21). Ferrel also discloses a means to edit a story thus enabling a proofreader or editor to update all information for a story in the editorial database or publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 7-15, Figure 5, and Column 23, lines 51-57). Ferrel also discloses a means to search for a story, using a search object, which would enable a proofreader to search for stories in the editorial database. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 48-51). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a means to enable a proofreader or editor to place a story on the website by updating records within the database table structure. Dabney discloses that an editor can update data within the database to alter the story content. See Dabney, Figure 6, Column 10, lines 23-37, and Column 12, lines 8-24). Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine the editorial maintenance program of Ferrel and Dasan with the means of updating database content of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 49.

As per claim 50, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a means for a proofreader or editor to correct key properties of a particular story. Also incorporated into this functionality is the ability to add pertinent properties for each story as determined by a user. Such properties could include author, keywords, town, kicker assignment, and kicker topic. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 41-67, Column 23, lines 1-5, and Figure 12). Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly a means to add, change or eliminate a particular field in the editorial database or publication storage, such as the topic ID, a means to append a story to the end of another story, or a means to replicate a story in the database. Dabney discloses that an editor can update data within the database to alter the story content or location. See Dabney, Figure 6, Column 10, lines 23-37, Column 12, lines 8-24, and Figure 9, element 940). All data in the database can be edited by the means disclosed by Dabney, which includes story content, appending story data from one location to another, and replicating story data from one location to another. (See Dabney, Figure 10, elements 1080 through 1075). Ferrel, Dasan and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data

electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the editorial maintenance program of Ferrel and Dasan with the means of updating database content of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

Claims 55 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claims 51 and 54 above, and further in view of Dabney (6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 55, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 54 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that news text electronic data files are associated with available image electronic data files. (See Ferrel, Column 23, lines 58-67, and Column 24, lines 1-10). Ferrel and Wical do not disclose expressly that the proofing step can consist of adding, changing or deleting records in the editorial database. Dabney also discloses that data stored in a relational database is maintained and edited by a plurality of content servers (See Dabney, Figure 3B, and Column 7, lines 3-4). The content server allows editors to electronically update the data. (See Dabney, Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-33 and Figure 11). It is inherently true that a relational database structure incorporates the ability to add, change, delete, reorganize and associate records within the database. Ferrel, Wical

and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proofing method of Ferrel and Wical with the content server programs of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of an interface that would enable an editor or proofreader to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Wical for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 55.

As per claim 59, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses an archiving program using containers for multiple projects. This program allows for the extraction, conversion, and storage of the news print publication electronic files. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 38-51, and figure 4). Ferrel and Wical do not disclose expressly that the text information is stored in an electronic news archive. Dabney discloses a content management system in which news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Since news information is collected and stored electronically on the relational database as disclosed by Dabney, this database serves as an electronic news archive. It is also inherently true that a relational database structure allows for the addition, modification, and deletion or removal of data. Ferrel, Wical and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the news text and image translation and composition apparatus of Ferrel and Wical with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Wical for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 59.

Claim 60 is rejected on the same basis as claim 59.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Riley (U.S. Patent 1,090,346).

As per claim 16, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of baseball box scores, top news stories of one section of the news, the relative team standings of a plurality of baseball leagues, football box scores, or the relative team standings of a plurality of football leagues. Riley discloses a method of presenting tabulated baseball score results in a form useful for publishing, which is included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 16. (See Riley, page 1, Column 1, lines 40-43, and figure 1). Ferrel, Dasan and Riley are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying sports scores in a printed media. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel and Dasan with the baseball box scores of Riley. The motivation for doing so would have been to present the baseball scoring results in a concise manner suitable for a limited amount of space. (See Riley, page 1, Column 1, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Riley with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of condensing baseball score information to be presented in a published media to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Jones (U.S. Publication 2001/0047373 A1).

As per claim 17, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of a bridal Web page template, an entertainment Web page template, a movie reviews Web page template, a cartoon Web page template, or a travel Web page template. Jones discloses the inclusion of cartoons in an online information display system. (See Jones, page 7, paragraph 0070). Ferrel, Dasan and Jones are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information in an electronic format. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel and Dasan with the cartoon images of Jones. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the reader of an electronic publication with the cartoon

images in a layout that allows them to view both the image and any associated text simultaneously. (See Jones, page 1, paragraph 0010, and page 7, paragraph 0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Jones with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of enhanced viewing of text and image data in an electronic format to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,301,574 B1).

As per claim 18, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of an archival Web page for presenting an entry allowing a reader to search the news story archive. Thomas discloses a system for providing information, applicable to an online newspaper application, which can be used in conjunction with a searching device to conduct searches of online news archives. (See Thomas, Column 10, lines 32-38). Ferrel, Dasan and Thomas are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing useful information in an electronic format. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel and Dasan with the archival search of Thomas. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a reader with the means to search for information from a large source of data to find specific topics of interest to the reader. (See Thomas, Column 10, lines 41-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomas with Ferrel and Dasan for the benefit of providing a means of searching a large amount of news archival data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) and Dabney (6,643,663 B1) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162).

As per claim 20, Ferrel, Dasan and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ferrel also discloses news story text and classification content (See Ferrel, Figure 6), news topic information and news topic classifications (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 402), news section information and news section classifications (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 412), news story source information (See Ferrel, Figure 6, elements 382 and 386, where the source of the news stories listed is shown to be "Reuter"), news story linkage information (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 422). Ferrel, Dasan and Dabney do not disclose expressly that the relational database contains geographic classification information. Smith discloses a document management system that contains geographic classification, or zone, information (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Smith also discloses the inclusion of news image caption information, which is presented in the form of headlines and associated photographs (See Smith, Column 16, lines 44-47). Ferrel, Dasan, Dabney and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting news

data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the specific data content information of Ferrel, Dasan and Smith with the relational database structure of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Also, the motivation for including the geographic data and image caption data of Smith would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content for specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for varying display of specific data relating text to images. (See Smith, Column 16, lines 49-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith, Dabney, Dasan and Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating, storage and distribution of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Claims 35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) and Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1) as applied to claims 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Dabney (6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 35, Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack disclose the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack do not disclose expressly that the publication storage resides on a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for

relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Dasan Kovack, and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the classified advertisements data storage system of Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 35.

As per claim 37, Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack disclose the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack do not disclose expressly that the death notices database is a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Dasan, Kovack, and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the death notices data of Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel, Dasan and Kovack for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

As per claim 38, Ferrel, Dasan, Kovack and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 37 as described above. By definition, the relational database disclosed in claim 37 contains data in the form of tables. (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables") It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to define a table or set of tables to contain death notice information. The motivation for doing so would have been to separate the death notice information in a relational structure which would provide for easy and efficient data updating and maintenance. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a separate death notices table as a part of the relational database of claim 37 for the benefit of improved data maintenance to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Claim 39 is rejected on the same basis as claims 35 and 37.

Claims 36 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662), Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1) and Dabney (6,643,663 B1) as applied to claims 35 and 39 above, and further in view of Reuning (U.S. Patent 6,381,592 B1).

As per claim 36, Ferrel, Dasan, Kovack and Dabney disclose the limitations of claims 7 and 35 above. Ferrel, Dasan, Kovack and Dabney do not disclose expressly the inclusion of help wanted or help wanted keyword data. Reuning discloses the inclusion of help wanted data and keyword input upon which to search the data (See Reuning, Column 1, lines 14-18, and Column 3, lines 10-22). Ferrel, Dasan, Kovack, Dabney and Reuning are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the help wanted data content and keyword information of Reuning with the relational database structure of Ferrel, Dasan, Kovack, and Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Also the motivation for including the help wanted data and keyword information of Reuning would have been to provide for more efficient job searching techniques using online data (See Reuning, Column 1, lines 18-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reuning, Kovack, Dabney, Dasan and Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating, storage and distribution of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

Claim 40 is rejected on the same basis as claims 36 and 38.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162) and Weeks (WO 98/470083).

As per claim 46, Ferrel and Dasan disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a set of containers, containing multiple projects of files, which can be used to categorize data files according to the needs of the user. Ferrel discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification based on multiple data elements or related subject matter in a story. (See Ferrel, Column 14, lines 2-5). Ferrel also discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's classification by using the story's kicker to determine a topic associated with the kicker in the database. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 52-56). Ferrel and Dasan do not disclose expressly that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification using the story's town to determine a topic associated with the town in the database, or by using a weighted count of keywords found to select the topic associated in the database. Smith discloses the use of zones, or geographic locations which includes towns, to determine a publication's circulation area. (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Weeks discloses ranking words within a text to determine the key terms based on a weighted average of occurrences. (See Weeks, page 2, lines 12-13, and page 5, lines 10-16). Ferrel, Dasan Smith and Weeks are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data

electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data filtering of Ferrel and Dasan with the geographic classification of Smith and the calculated keyword occurrence of Weeks. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content classified by specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for improved story classifications based on main topics, thus allowing the reader to find a topic of interest by entering a keyword (See Weeks, page 2, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ferrel, Dasan, Smith and Weeks for the benefit of improved data distribution within the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 46.

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162) and Weeks (WO 98/470083).

As per claim 53, Ferrel and Wical disclose the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a set of containers, containing multiple projects of files, which can be used to categorize data files according to the needs of the user. Ferrel discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification based on multiple data elements or related subject matter in a story. (See Ferrel, Column 14, lines 2-5). Ferrel also discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's classification by using the story's kicker to determine a topic

associated with the kicker in the database. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 52-56). Ferrel and Wical do not disclose expressly that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification using the story's town to determine a topic associated with the town in the database, or by using a weighted count of keywords found to select the topic associated in the database. Smith discloses the use of zones, or geographic locations which includes towns, to determine a publication's circulation area. (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Weeks discloses ranking words within a text to determine the key terms based on a weighted average of occurrences. (See Weeks, page 2, lines 12-13, and page 5, lines 10-16). Ferrel, Wical, Smith and Weeks are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data filtering of Ferrel and Wical with the geographic classification of Smith and the calculated keyword occurrence of Weeks. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content classified by specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for improved story classifications based on main topics, thus allowing the reader to find a topic of interest by entering a keyword (See Weeks, page 2, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ferrel, Wical, Smith and Weeks for the benefit of improved data distribution within the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 53.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3 and 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Office believes that, with obvious modification from one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, Ferrel in view of Dasan reads upon independent claim 1, and, with obvious modification from one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, Ferrel in view of Wical reads upon independent claims 3 and 51.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- White (U.S. Publication 2002/0128935 A1) discloses a many-to-many mediated commercial electronic publishing method and system.
- Zhou (U.S. Publication 2002/0124048 A1) discloses a Web-based interactive multimedia story authoring system and method.
- Bellotti discloses changes in the publishing industry with the growth of multimedia computing.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Field, can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)
Or:
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2176

Or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

LR
11/9/2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER